

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2006

 4 DDV 10 4 TTO 1 NO	FU DIC DATE	FIRST NAME OF THE PROPERTY OF	1 THORNEY DOCKET NO	CONTENDANTION	_
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/604,841	08/21/2003	Huy Lam Thai	45496.18	1840	
22828	7590 09/22/2006	EXAMINER			
	YOO C/O BENNETT.	MAHAFKEY, KELLY J			
1000 ATCO (	CENTRE	<del></del>			
10035 - 105 \$	STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
<b>EDMONTON</b>	I, ALBERTA, AB T5J	1761			
CANADA					

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	10/604,841	THAI ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Kelly Mahafkey	1761					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 12 September 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THI							
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
	a) 🔯 The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) 🗍 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In						
,	no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origor than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for							
appeal; and/or	tter form for appear by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues ioi				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		jected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>							
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.				
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Attached Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13.  Other:							
		•					

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Application No.

Applicant's comments filed September 12, 2006 have been considered but are not deemed persuasive. The rejections are maintained for the reasons of record, as set forth in the Final Office Action.

Regarding applicant's argument that that the "Smith reference teach very low moisture product" and that "in the LaBaw reference, a similar low moisture content is described", it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the moisture content of the final product) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Applicant's claims are directed to the moisture content of dried fruit pieces within the final product.

Regarding the moisture content of the fruit pieces, as stated in the previous Office Actions, Smith teaches of dehydrated or evaporated apple pieces (Smith Column 7 lines 44-56) and Brennan teaches that evaporated apples have a moisture content of 10-25% (Brennan Page 139). Thus, the references and rejection of record teach of dried fruit pieces with a moisture content of 10-25%, a moisture content within the range as claimed by applicant.

KEITH HENDRICKS
PRIMARY EXAMINES